

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the non-final Office Action of July 2, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kimura et al.* (“*Kimura*”) (U.S. Patent No. 6,518,962) in view of *Brody* (U.S. Patent No. 4,982,273) and further in view of *Matsuo, et al.* (“*Matsuo*”) (U.S. Patent No. 5,414,547). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner’s disposition below. Claim 8 is newly added.

Referring to Applicants’ Figure 7 as an illustrative example, claims 1 and 6, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to an organic electroluminescence display having a substrate and a device layer provided on the substrate. The device layer includes a plurality of luminescent devices that each have an emitting area (each emitting area designated by dashed lines in Figure 7). A contact 39 electrically connects each luminescent device to a corresponding pixel circuit. The contact 39 is provided between adjacent emitting areas of the luminescent devices and between adjacent upper pixel electrodes that each cover a respective one of the emitting areas.

This is clearly unlike *Kimura* in view of *Brody* and further in view of *Matsuo*, which fails to disclose or suggest a contact that is provided between adjacent emitting areas of luminescent devices and between adjacent upper pixel electrodes that each cover a respective one of the emitting areas. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Brody* and *Kimura* fail to teach Applicants’ claimed contacts that are located outside of light emitting areas of luminescent devices. *Office Action of 7/2/07*, page 3.

Matsuo also fails to disclose or suggest Applicants’ claimed contacts. Specifically, *Matsuo* fails to teach or suggest a contact that is both 1) between adjacent emitting areas of luminescent devices and 2) between adjacent upper pixel electrodes that each cover a respective one of the emitting areas. Referring to *Matsuo* Figure 24, *Matsuo* fails to teach or suggest a contact that is disposed between adjacent upper pixel electrodes that each cover a respective one of the emitting areas. In fact, *Matsuo* fails to teach upper pixel electrodes as claimed. Further, neither *Kimura* nor *Brody*, taken singly or in combination, teaches or suggests a contact that is both 1) between adjacent emitting areas of luminescent devices and 2) between adjacent upper pixel electrodes that each cover a respective one of the emitting areas.

Further, unlike Applicants’ claimed invention that relates to an OLED device, *Matsuo* relates to an LCD device. Accordingly, *Matsuo* is non-analogous art relative to Applicants’ claimed invention.

Therefore, *Kimura* in view of *Brody* and further in view of *Matsuo* fails to teach or suggest claims 1 and 6.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 6 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 6 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that Claims 1-8 are clearly patentable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher P. Rauch/
Christopher P. Rauch
Registration No.: 45,034
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000

14530238